

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I212-3

Short Proposal Title: Next Phase Funding for Expanding Salmon Habitat Through Non-Regulatory Mechanisms

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

This proposal is a difficult one to assess. It seems it is a proposal to promote the authors personal views regarding the PG&E divestiture of land, power plants, and dams. There is no clear hypothesis provided nor a clearly stated proposal. The hypothesis included is that decision makers will recognize that the grant proponents have the correct approach and will pass the proposed legislation that supports their views.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There is no valid conceptual model included. Again, it emphasizes the need to promote their particular solution to the divestiture questions. Although their legislation and/or approach may have considerable merit, this is not appropriate for an environmental education project. It is more of a proposal for funds for a lobbying effort. Had the proposal been solely to share information on all aspects of this divestiture to all key stakeholders, rather than promote one view, it would have been in line with an environmental education approach.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The approach would seem to be appropriate for a lobbying effort.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

This criteria is not as appropriate for an environmental education project.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The whole purpose of this proposal is to share one particular point of view with the legislators in the decision making process.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There a monitoring and assessment plan included, however one of the elements of the assessment plan is whether or not they were able to obtain public support for their position. This would be appropriate for assessing a lobbying campaign, but not for an environmental education project.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There is a data handling and storage component in their grant application. This includes making sure that pertinent information is shared with the decision makers and the public; again using a format to advocate their personal opinions about the divestiture process.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

I estimate that the project is technically feasible.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

I estimate that the project team is qualified to implement the proposed project, although there is no information about the individual who has signed the grant proposal.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

This project in my opinion does not qualify for environmental education funding. It is a proposal for funding to advocate one position. It does not try to develop a collaborative approach between all the parties, but seeks to lobby for the position of the grant applicators.

Overall Evaluation	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

Summary Rating

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor XXX

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

